

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 31, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 31, 2007. Claims 4, 10-11 and 21 have been amended to correct matters of form. Claims 1, 14 and 17 have been amended to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. Claims 5-6, 8, 12-13, 19, 25, 27, 29-30 and 40 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims, thereby placing them in condition for allowance. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein. The amendments have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 7, 10-11 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner takes the position that the limitation “at least one second velocity meter” in claim 7 is confusing since there is no first velocity meter in claim 1 or in claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner takes the position that “The method” limitation in claims 10-11 lack antecedent basis. Claims 10-11 have been amended to replace “The method” with “The apparatus”. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner takes the position that the limitation “a second velocity meter” in claim 21 lacks antecedent basis. Accordingly, claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 19. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 14-18, 23-24 and 38-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 542858581 (“Doisy et al.”). Doisy et al generally describe a method for compensating for the movement of the antenna for a sonar. However, Doisy et al do not teach or disclose a library comprising a plurality of sets of

computed Doppler-shifted positioning signals, each set corresponding to one of the plurality of positioning signals, as recited in amended claim 1. Likewise, Doisy et al do not teach or disclose determining at least one velocity; and determining at least one computed Doppler-shifted positioning signal using the at least one positioning signal and the at least one velocity, as recited in claim 14. Also, Doisy et al do not teach or disclose providing an index to the plurality of computed Doppler-shifted positioning signals, as recited in claim 24. Further, Doisy et al do not teach or disclose determining the plurality of computed Doppler-shifted positioning signals for each of the plurality of positioning signals using the plurality of velocities; and an index of the plurality of computed Doppler-shifted positioning signals, as recited in claim 39. Accordingly, claims 1, 14, 24 and 39 are patentable over Doisy et al. Claims 4, 15-18, 23 and 38 are also patentable since they depend from claims 1, 14 and 24 respectively. Claims 2-3 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to those claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-6, 8-9, 12-13, 19-20, 25-37 and 40-42 stand objected. Since no further comments are provided in the office action, Applicant respectfully assumes that these claims are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 5-6, 8, 12-13, 19, 25, 27, 29-30 and 40 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims. Claims 5-6, 8, 12-13, 19, 25, 27, 29-30 and 40 are therefore in condition for allowance. Claims 9, 20, 26, 28, 31-37 and 41-42 are also in condition for allowance since they depend from claims 5-6, 8, 12-13, 19, 25, 27, 29-30 and 40 respectively.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion

of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/

Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

Pramudji Wendt & Tran, LLP

1800 Bering, Suite 540

Houston, Texas 77057

Telephone: (713) 468-4600

Facsimile: (713) 980-9882

Attorney for Assignee